

Serial No. 10/721,883
Filed: November 26, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the above application in view of the above amendments and the below remarks is requested.

In the Office Action, the Patent Office maintained the prior restriction requirement and has withdrawn claims 12, 30, and 39 to 51. Additionally, claim 1 was directed to two groups of the prior restriction requirement and applicants elected the formula of (I). Formula (II) has been deleted from claim 1 and together with claims 12, 30, and 39 to 51, previously identified as withdrawn and have now been canceled, applicants reserve the right to prosecute these inventions in separate applications as divisional applications.

The above claims have been amended to further define the invention. Claim 19 has been rewritten as an independent claim but no additional fee is required as the number of independent claims is same as originally filed and total claims is less than those filed. If applicants are incorrect, the Patent Office is authorized to charge the fee for an additional independent claim to Deposit Account No. 50-3309.

In the Office Action, the Patent Office rejected claims 1 to 5, 7 to 9, 13 to 16, 19 to 23, 25 to 27 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable, over Baumann et al (United States Patent No. 4079041). This rejection is traversed.

The Patent Office rejected the claims alleging that Baumann et al discloses the polymers in applicants' claims when Y1 in Baumann et al is a hydroxyl alkylene linkage and R₂₄ with R₂₆ in the present claims forms a bond, stating that it could be obvious to use hydroxyalkylene for Y1 in Baumann et al.

Serial No. 10/721,883
Filed: November 26, 2003

R₂₄ with R₂₆ in the present claims form, among other moieties as mentioned in claim 1, a direct bond, not a double bond as would be shown by Baumann et al. The double bond in Baumann et al makes its maleimide moiety light sensitive (see, for example, the abstract thereof) where applicants' group is not. There is no motivation in Baumann et al to replace its double bond in the maleimide to form applicants' pendant moiety. It is also noted that Baumann et al do not disclose the use of the polymers therein as antireflective coatings (claim 19).


Applicants have filed concurrently with this Amendment a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, which reports the results of an International Search Report (ISR) and a Written Opinion (WO) related thereto. One document cited in the ISR and the WO which was not previously made of record is US 5424364. This document does not disclose antireflective coatings and does not disclose the compounds of claims 13 to 18.

The rejection is traversed and withdrawal thereof is requested.

Serial No. 10/721,883
Filed: November 26, 2003

Applicants submit that the concerns of the Patent Office have been addressed. Withdrawal of the rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Alan P. Kass
(Reg. No. 32142)
70 Meister Avenue
Somerville, New Jersey 08876
Telephone: (908) 595-3890
Telefax: (908) 429-3650

Customer No. 26,289